

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

KATHLEEN C. PEREA,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. CIV-13-0697 KG/LAM

JANIE S. CONNER and
STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND
DEADLINES TO RESPOND TO MOTIONS [Doc. 118]**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on *Plaintiff's Agreed Motion to Extend the Deadlines to Respond to Defendants' Motions to Compel and to Modify the Scheduling Order* (Doc. 118), filed June 11, 2014. Plaintiff asks the Court to extend her deadlines to respond to Defendants' motions to compel [Docs. 99 and 100] and to Defendants' motion to modify the scheduling order and allow additional depositions [Doc. 102] to June 20, 2014. Having considered the motion and record of the case, the Court **FINDS** that the motion should be **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**.

The Court finds two problems with Plaintiff's motion. First, an agreed upon extension of time to file a response or a reply to a motion requires only a notification to the Court -- not a motion. See D.N.M. LR-Civ. 7.4(a) ("For each agreed extension, the party requesting the extension must file a notice identifying the new deadline and the document (response or reply) to be filed."). Second, on June 5, 2014, the Court entered an order on *Defendant Connor's Partially Opposed Motion to Modify Scheduling Order to Extend Discovery and Allow Additional*

Depositions (Doc. 102), granting the motion in part as to the issue that was not opposed by Plaintiff, and denying it in part without prejudice with leave to re-file by June 13, 2014 in accordance with the Court's instructions. Thus, no response is due since the motion has already been ruled on by the Court. *See* [Doc. 110]. The Court instructs counsel for Plaintiff to review the Court's local rules and the orders entered in this case in order to avoid causing additional unnecessary work for the Court in the future. The Court will grant this motion in part to extend Plaintiff's deadline to respond to Defendants' motions to compel [Docs. 99 and 100] to June 20, 2014.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that *Plaintiff's Agreed Motion to Extend the Deadlines to Respond to Defendants' Motions to Compel and to Modify the Scheduling Order* (Doc. 118) is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**, and Plaintiff may respond to Defendants' motions to compel [Docs. 99 and 100] **on or before June 20, 2014**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



LOURDES A. MARTÍNEZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE